

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES *
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. PR-CI-03-10291/0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 07/01/03	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. PR-CI-03-10291	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY Environmental Protection Agency Contracts Management Division 26 W. Martin Luther King Drive Cincinnati, OH 45268	CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) Not Applicable.	CODE
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code) To All Offerors/Bidders.		(✓)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. PR-CI-03-10291
			9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 06/12/03
		✓	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE	FACILITY CODE		
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS			
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended.</p> <p>Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:</p> <p>(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u> 1 </u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.</p>			
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)			
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.			
(✓)	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A		
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).		
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:		
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)		
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.			
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)			
This amendment does not change the proposal submission date of 7/22/03. This amendment answers technical questions.			
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.			
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)	
		NANCY A. MUZZY	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		_____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	

NSN 7540-01-152-8070

PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE

30-105

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA
FAR (48 CFR) 52.243

AMENDMENTS TO THE SOLICITATION

I. Purpose of Amendment:

The purpose of this amendment is to answer technical questions regarding the RFP. This amendment does not change the due date of the proposal.

II. The attachment entitled "QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS" has been added. The text is as follows:

Questions for EPA Regarding Solicitation PR-CI-03-10291

Technical and Regulatory Support For The Development of Criteria For Water Media (Ecological Emphasis)

Question No. 1.

In the Technical Evaluation Criteria Section A.1. - Corporate Technical Experience of the RFP, EPA states:

“Demonstration should be made by providing written summaries of completed projects that reflect the types of work in the above sections. (Single or multiple, but not more than five example(s) may be used to address the types of activities listed. Total pages for all examples, combined, should not exceed 15.)”

Could EPA clarify what “the types of activities listed” refer to (e.g., major scope of work areas). In addition, is there a 15 page limit for Section A.1 of the submitted proposal?

Answer to question No. 1

Types of Activities for which examples are requested are any or all of the activities included in the listed subsections of Section 2 (2.3, 2.5-2.7, 2.9 - 2.12, 2.14 - 2.18) and presented in Section 3 of the SOW. The offeror may provide up to five examples that each demonstrate corporate experience in one or more of the these subsections or sections.

Per Attachment 4, “Technical Proposal Instructions”, proposals are limited to 300 pages. Per Attachment 3, “Technical Evaluation Criterion”, Criteria A.1, it specifies that *examples* demonstrating the requested capabilities and experience are limited to 15 pages. The total response to criteria A.1 is included in the 300 page limitation, but only 15 pages of that response is to be allocated for examples. The 300 page limitation includes those 15 pages, but the response to A.1 can total more than 15 pages if there is supplementary text explaining the relevance of those examples, etc.

Question No. 2

In the Technical Evaluation Criteria Section B.1 - Basic, the point total next to the B.1 header is 50, but the three sections listed for the section only add up to 40 points. Is there a section missing, or should the points be distributed differently among the three subgroups?

Answer to question No. 2

Yes, a section is missing.

The total should be 50. Please include a response to B.1(4) in your proposal, as follows:

4. collection of data from data bases and literature and determination of data quality; preparing method for prioritizing chemicals for risk assessment; conducting statistical analyses. 10 Pts.

Question No. 3

In the Cost Proposal Instructions, hours for P level 1 staff have not been allocated. Would it be more cost effective to allocate hours to P1 staff to support activities such as workshops and literature searches (obtaining articles from the library)?

Answer to Question No. 3

Hours for P1 staff were not allocated because we have found in the past that over the life of our contracts P1 staff were rarely used. The costing presented in the RFP is provided as a standard for all offerors to propose to.

Question No. 4

The labor categories in the cost proposal may not encompass all the key personnel roles we will present. An example is a Scientific Technical Writer that is a P4 level (not listed) vs. the same title as a P3 (listed). Can we list the P4 person anyways, thereby technically creating a new labor category? What are our options?

Answer to Question No. 4

The offeror should bid on the P levels and key personnel roles presented in the RFP. Any personnel included in the proposal should be bid at the actual rate used for payment of that personnel, regardless of the P-level designation utilized in the proposal, and must meet the

qualifications of that particular P-level where they are being proposed. If the offeror wants to include categories/P-levels that were not part of the RFP, that would be permissible, however the hours assigned to those categories where proposed must be “over and above” the RFP-specified amounts, not instead of those listed.

Question No. 5

Evaluation Criterion A states the following: "Demonstrated corporate experience fulfilling the requirements of contracts [emphasis added] similar to those outlined in this solicitation relative to the following subcriteria." However, Evaluation Subcriterion A.1 (Corporate Technical Experience) refers to projects, rather than contracts: "...Demonstration should be made by providing written summaries of completed projects [emphasis added] that reflect the types of work in the above sections..." Should corporate technical experience under A.1 be demonstrated through contracts (which may include multiple projects) or individual projects?

Answer to Question No. 5

Either is acceptable as long as sufficient detail is provided to demonstrate experience in the specified sections of the SOW.

Question No. 6

Evaluation subcriterion A.1. states that the total pages for all technical examples, combined, is a maximum of 15 pages. We assume that this maximum applies to the examples themselves, but does not include the text used in Subcriterion A.1 to introduce the examples. Please confirm whether this assumption is correct.

Answer to Question No. 6

Per Attachment 4, “Technical Proposal Instructions”, proposals are limited to 300 pages. Per Attachment 3, “Technical Evaluation Criterion”, Criteria A.1, it specifies that *examples* demonstrating the requested capabilities and experience are limited to 15 pages. The total response to criteria A.1 is included in the 300 page limitation, but only 15 pages of that response is to be allocated for examples. The 300 page limitation includes those 15 pages, but the response to A.1 can total more than 15 pages if there is supplementary text explaining the relevance of those examples, etc.

Question No. 7

There is a discrepancy between the Technical Proposal Instructions and the Evaluation Criteria in referencing subcriteria under C. In the Technical Proposal Instructions (page 4-4), we believe that the reference to subcriterion C.1 (which relates to the Program Manager's technical qualifications) applies specifically to evaluation subcriterion C.1.1, (which relates to the Program Manager's technical qualifications). On page 4-5, there are two different references to subcriterion C.2. We believe that the first mention of subcriterion C.2 (which refers to credentials and management experience of the proposed Program Manager) applies to evaluation subcriterion C.1.2 (which addresses the Program Manager's management experience). We believe that the next use of subcriterion C.2, correctly refers to credentials and management experience of the Proposed Team Leaders. Please confirm whether these assumptions are correct.

Answer to Question No. 7

Yes, the questioners statement is correct. Please note the clarification below and respond accordingly:

- Technical Evaluation Criterion C.1.1 should follow instructions listed at C.1 in the Technical Proposal Instructions.
- Technical Evaluation Criterion C.1.2 should follow instructions listed as C.2 on top of Page 4-5 of the Technical Proposal Instructions.
- Technical Evaluation Criterion C.2 should follow instructions listed as C.2 on bottom of Page 4-5 of the Technical Proposal Instructions.